

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to correct some informalities in connection with removing the letter designations as they conflict with other letter designations recited in some claims (e.g., claims 6, 7, 14, 15 & 16) dependent on claim 1. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-21 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 9-12, 15, and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – Raynal Reference in view of Blalock Reference

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9-12, 15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the reasons set forth in paragraph 3 of the Action on pages 7 to 13. Specifically, claims 1, 4, 5, 9-12, 15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raynal et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,643,389), in view of Blalock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,729,008), which is hereinafter referred to as the Blalock reference.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

It is respectfully that Raynal, whether alone or in combination with Blalock, fails to teach or suggest, "single sensor integrated circuit having" as claimed. First, neither Raynal nor Blalock discloses a fingerprint imager with the claimed elements in "a single sensor integrated circuit," as claimed. Raynal utilizes at least two separate components (i.e., a rectangular sensor array 13 and a mouse device 19, see col. 1, lines 38-40 and col. 1, lines 56-57.) Similarly, Blalock appears to utilize at least an imaging sensor 22 and two navigation sensor 24, 26 along with other electronic components housed in scanning device 10 (see FIGS. 2 and 3 and col. 4, lines 28-35). It is noted

that although Blalock discloses that the navigation sensor 24 or 26 (col. 5, lines 10-20) is preferably implemented as a single integrated chip. Blalock clearly teaches that the imaging sensor 22 and navigation sensors are implemented as separate electronic components (see FIG. 2, col. 4, lines 27-35, 50-56). Consequently, the teachings of Blalock reference contravene the explicit claim language that recites that the imaging array and navigation array are implemented in "the single sensor integrated circuit," as claimed. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that Blalock teaches away from the claimed invention.

Rejection of Claims 13, 14 & 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – Raynal and Blalock References in view of Akizuki Reference

Claims 13, 14 & 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the reasons set forth in paragraph 5 of the Action on pages 14 & 15. Specifically, claims 13, 14 & 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raynal et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,643,389) and Blalock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,729,008), which is hereinafter referred to as the Blalock reference, and further in view of Akizuki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,004), which is hereinafter referred to as the Akizuki reference.

The Akizuki reference is cited for teaching that "it is known to implement a fingerprint sensor as a touch-pad, or a stand-alone unit, wherein the fingerprint imager further comprises a capacitive sensor having a surface along which a finger is moved and an assembly for housing the capacitive sensor." In particular, col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 17-20 of Akizuki are cited.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 are respectfully traversed, at least insofar as applied to the amended claims, and reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

It is respectfully submitted that the Raynal reference, whether alone or in combination with Blalock and Akizuki, fails to teach or suggest "the fingerprint imager is implemented in a stand-alone unit and wherein the fingerprint imager further comprises: a) a capacitive sensor having a

surface along which a finger is moved; and b) an assembly for housing the capacitive sensor.” For the reasons advanced previously, which are incorporated herein by reference, Raynal, whether alone or in combination with Blalock, fails to teach or suggest one or more claimed limitations of the independent claims. Akizuki does not remedy the deficiencies of Raynal and Blalock, nor does Akizuki supplement the teachings of Raynal and Blalock in a manner to render the claimed invention obvious.

Accordingly, for these reasons, and for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13 and 14 patentably distinguish over Raynal in view of Blalock further in view of Akizuki. Withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the reasons set forth in paragraph 10 of the Action on pages 11-12. Specifically, claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raynal et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,643,389) and Blalock et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,729,008), which is hereinafter referred to as the Blalock reference, and further in view of Brownlee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,303), which is hereinafter referred to as the Brownlee reference.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 are respectfully traversed, at least insofar as applied to the amended claims, and reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

The Brownlee reference is cited for teaching the implementation of a fingerprint imager in a stand-alone unit with optics for focusing light onto the surface. For the reasons advanced previously, which are incorporated herein by reference, Raynal, whether alone or in combination with Blalock, fails to teach or suggest one or more claimed limitations of the independent claims. Brownlee does not remedy the deficiencies of Raynal and Blalock, nor does Brownlee supplement the teachings of Raynal and Blalock in a manner to render the claimed invention obvious.

Specifically, Raynal, whether alone or in combination with Blalock and Brownlee, fails to teach or suggest, "a) an imaging array having a plurality of sensors arranged along a first axis for capturing a sub-image of the fingerprint at one time; wherein the fingerprint is moved with respect to the imaging array in a direction that is generally perpendicular to the first axis; and b) a mechanism for determining a change in the position of the fingerprint with respect to time and controlling the image capture of the imaging array," as claimed.

Accordingly, for these reasons, and for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6-8 patentably distinguish over Raynal in view of Blalock further in view of Brownlee. Withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) is respectfully requested.

For all the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are requested, and allowance is earnestly solicited at an early date. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any suggestions, thoughts or comments, which might expedite the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,




Eric Ho, Reg. No. 39,711
Attorney for Applicant

Law Offices of Eric Ho
20601 Bergamo Way
Northridge, CA 91326

Tel: (818) 998-7220
Fax: (818) 998-7242

Dated: January 19, 2006

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (fax no.: 571-273-8300) on the date below.


Eric Ho (RN 39,711)

January 19, 2006
(Date)